

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:14-cv-01385-PSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO CONDUCT THIRD-
PARTY DISCOVERY**

(Re: Docket No. 177)

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

KYOCERA CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:14-cv-02894-PSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO CONDUCT THIRD-
PARTY DISCOVERY**

(Re: Docket No. 185)

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

KYOCERA CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:14-cv-02895-PSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO CONDUCT THIRD-
PARTY DISCOVERY**

(Re: Docket No. 192)

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZTE CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:15-cv-00165-PSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO CONDUCT THIRD-
PARTY DISCOVERY**

(Re: Docket No. 268)

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZTE CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:15-cv-00166-PSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO CONDUCT THIRD-
PARTY DISCOVERY**

(Re: Docket No. 266)

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZTE CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:15-cv-00167-PSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO CONDUCT THIRD-
PARTY DISCOVERY**

(Re: Docket No. 260)

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZTE CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:15-cv-00168-PSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO CONDUCT THIRD-
PARTY DISCOVERY**

(Re: Docket No. 222)

Before the court is a motion by Adaptix, Inc., Plaintiff in each of these related cases. Adaptix seeks leave to conduct discovery on non-party Qualcomm Incorporated after the close of fact discovery.¹ Adaptix has since confirmed that further discovery in most of these cases—the

¹ See Case No. 14-1385, Docket No. 177; Case No. 14-2894, Docket No. 185; Case No. 14-2895, Docket No. 192; Case No. 15-0165, Docket No. 268; Case No. 15-0166, Docket No. 266; Case No. 15-0167, Docket No. 260; Case No. 15-0168, Docket No. 222.

ones involving Defendants Sony Mobile Communications, Inc. and ZTE Corporation²—is unwarranted because the cases are likely to settle or be dismissed.³ The only remaining issue, therefore, is whether third-party discovery is justified in the two cases involving Defendant Kyocera Corporation.⁴

Adaptix acknowledges that its subpoenas to Qualcomm in the Kyocera cases did not request that Qualcomm produce any source code. Although Adaptix characterizes this as an associate's oversight, Adaptix did not correct the mistake in the several months after it issued the subpoena in July. There is no process by which the court may order further discovery under Fed. R. Civ. P. 45. The motion is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 12, 2015



PAUL S. GREWAL
United States Magistrate Judge

² See Case No. 14-1385; Case No. 15-0165; Case No. 15-0166; Case No. 15-0167; Case No. 15-0168.

³ See Case No. 14-1385, Docket No. 186; Case No. 14-2894, Docket No. 188; Case No. 14-2895, Docket No. 196; Case No. 15-0165, Docket No. 279; Case No. 15-0166, Docket No. 273; Case No. 15-0167, Docket No. 267; Case No. 15-0168, Docket No. 229.

⁴ See Case No. 14-2894; Case No. 14-2895.